

CC378
C741E

REVIEW

— OF —

PROF. R. A. YODER'S
"Situation in North Carolina."

BY A COMMITTEE.

ERRATA.

The kind reader is requested to correct the following typographical errors, which mar the sense of what should be expressed:

Page 5, line 18 from bottom, substitute "this declaration" for "the assertion."

" 21, " 11 " top, change "prepared" to "proposed."
 " 29, " 13 " " *insert the words "of Dort" after "The Synod."*

" 40, " 7 " " read "make" for "made."

" 40, " 7 " bottom, read "English Conference" for "Augsburg Confession."

" 39, " 9 " top: after this line insert the following heading of a new chapter: Does the Tennessee Synod teach the doctrine of election in view of faith?



REVIEW

— OF —

PROF. R. A. YODER'S

“Situation in North Carolina.”

BY A COMMITTEE.

PREFACE.

It is with sincere regret that the authors of this pamphlet ask an impartial public for a brief hearing of *their side* of a case, on which the public so far has heard *one side*. The matters to be discussed are, in part at least, of such a character that a charitably-disposed mind should wish to have them discussed in private, brother facing brother. However, since public attention has been invited to them, the authors of the present pamphlet cannot justly be criticised for issuing this defense, as their silence might, in parts where they are not known, be interpreted as an admission of their guilt.

David, in his complaint against Doeg, says: "I am for peace: but when I speak, they are for war." (Ps. 120:7.) The authors of this pamphlet have, on more than one occasion, had a similar experience with their present opponents. If, therefore, this pamphlet should accomplish what all their previous efforts have not accomplished in their opponents—namely, of convincing them of the just right and honest intentions of Missouri in North Carolina, the authors would consider that the best reward of all their past and present toils in behalf of that peace and unity of the Church which is commanded.—Eph. 4:3-6.

W. H. T. DAU,
GEO. A. ROMOSER,
J. M. SMITH,
L. BUCHHEIMER,
C. L. COON,
C. H. BERNHEIM.

Review of Prof. Yoder's "Situation In North Carolina."

Lately the public has been made acquainted with the "Situation in North Carolina," a pamphlet by Prof. R. A. Yoder, of Hickory.

Of course, Prof. Yoder gives *his* version of the situation. He claims that there are disturbances and divisions in churches of the Tennessee Synod on account of the presence of "Missouri" in Catawba county. The *disturbing centre* seems to be Conover and Concordia Collegé. Prof. Yoder claims that he writes his pamphlet because of these divisions, hoping thereby to allay strife and discord, which may be commendable even in one who has made a good deal of the disturbance of which he now complains. But Prof. Yoder should write as a true student of history and facts, and not as the advocate of a *cause*, which he is laboring to uphold. He speaks of the *school question* first, and that, no doubt, is the proper way to treat the subject, because it is highly probable that if there had been no school trouble there would have been no seeming necessity on his part to *put himself in print*.

It is not our purpose to write a history of Concordia College, but only to reply to some of the misstatements of facts contained in the pamphlet referred to above.

A REVISED VERSION OF THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN THE TENNESSEE SYNOD.

Among other things, Prof. Yoder says : * * *

"And the school was finally located at Conover, against the wishes of a majority of the people." And again, "In this arbitrary proceeding a great majority of our people never acquiesced. Some of our people did lay aside their preferences in the matter of location, for the sake of the peace of the church, and aided in the erection of buildings at Conover, although never satisfied with the location."

Prof. Yoder asserts that at several meetings of the Lu-

661174

therans of this section, it was decided to locate the school at Hickory. And why it was not done, Prof. Yoder, in brief, says that we need only remember that Rev. J. M. Smith was the only Lutheran pastor in Catawba county in 1875, that he had sons to educate, and that he lived in one mile of Conover. Prof. Yoder never told the public that Concordia College was NOT permanently located at Conover in 1875. Prof. Yoder ought to have known that this was done in 1877, and AFTER Dr. P. C. Henkel had returned to Conover. But accepting Prof. Yoder's version, we are forced to conclude that the people of Catawba Co in 1875 were not able to look after their best interest—that they were *duped* and *humbugged* by Rev. J. M. Smith and kept *still* about it, all for the sake of peace. Strange, indeed, that only a few years ago these people of Catawba county loved peace so well, and now there is such a WAR that even the peace-loving Prof. Yoder almost calls for an armistice in order that he may advise the combatants under which banner to fight. But stranger than all this is the fact that Prof. Yoder himself was a teacher at Conover almost uninterruptedly from January 22, 1878, to May, 1891. and that, too, along with Dr. P. C. Henkel and never found out till 1891 that he was *being worked* in the unholy cause! And worse still and stranger still does it look for Prof. Yoder's sincerity and the correctness of his present statements when it is remembered that the Professor worked shoulder to shoulder all this while with that INFLUENTIAL DISREGARDER of majorities, Rev. J. M. Smith! Prof. Yoder has left no record that he ever, prior to this time, admonished Rev. Smith for his "high-handed" methods in locating the school at Conover. If what Prof. Yoder says is true, we cannot refrain from picturing to him the bad company he was in while he was here at Conover laboring to establish what he openly proclaimed was a Christian school, while at the same time he must have known that it was conceived and founded in selfish motives and procured at Conover by "UNCHRISTIAN CONDUCT." Or was, perhaps, even Prof. Yoder once a silent partner in the sins which he now so boldly lays to the charge of Rev. J. M. Smith?

Prof. Yoder seems to be over-careful to give his authority for his statements in regard to the school question. Does the author of this pamphlet wish to leave the impression that he never knew the history of Concordia College,

though he was one of its FIRST teachers, and was connected with it for OVER TEN YEARS of its earliest history?

But let us see how it came about that the school was built at Conover, and let us see, too, who put it there.

The agitation in favor of a Lutheran school in Catawba county grew out of a debate, was FIRST agitated after a debate which Rev. J. M. Smith had with Rev. Daniel May, a Methodist, on the 7th and 8th days of August, 1874, and NOT after the Henkel-May debate, which was in April, 1875, nor the Schmidt-May debate, which was in July, 1875. The agitation arose in this way:

The Reformed people of this section took sides with May in the Smith-May debate in 1874. The Reformed school, Catawba College, at Newton, (where Prof. W. P. Cline was once a teacher, while Prof. Yoder was at Conover) was up to that time patronized by the Lutherans of this part of the State. The fact that the Reformed people took sides with May, a Methodist, opened the eyes of some people around Conover as to their duty, and they went to Rev. Smith and urged the founding of a Lutheran school at or near Conover. Andrew Holler, of Conover, was one of the first men who proposed this matter to Rev. Smith. Then Dr. Henkel came back here on a visit in 1875; he was urged to remain. He refused to return to North Carolina unless, he said, he could be instrumental in building up a Lutheran school in this section. Of course, the assertion on the part of Dr. Henkel increased the school sentiment. He went back to Missouri. Soon afterwards a meeting of delegates from the various congregations of this section was called at the instance of some persons favorable to a school at Conover. The delegates met at Newton. At this meeting some favored Hickory as the school site, others Newton, and still others Conover. A committee was appointed to examine the merits of each place and report. This committee reported at another meeting held at Newton. The committee report was favorable to Hickory, and the delegates decided the school should be built there. But *resolutions* did not build schools in 1875, nor do they do so now. Hickory was asked to see how much money could be raised for the school buildings, and about \$1,200 was subscribed. But the buildings were not begun. Other meetings were held, locating the school first at Conover, then at Hickory, and so on. It would be of no benefit to trace the ups and

downs of the college through all these meetings. The school question was almost dead, when in the spring of 1877, Dr. Henkel returned to North Carolina. Another meeting was then called at Newton. The claims of each—Hickory, Conover and Newton—were again presented. Finally it was agreed to leave the location to the place raising the largest subscription for the school buildings, a seemingly fair way to settle the question. Another meeting was called at St. Paul's some time afterward. The principal business was presented by Dr. Henkel, he reading a paper forth the character of the school he and others wanted, viz., a distinctively Lutheran school, where the Bible and Luther's Catechism should be taught daily. His paper was discussed. The kind of school Dr. Henkel wanted was opposed by Marcus Yoder, of Hickory, and others. The next meeting was held at St. John's Church on August 18, 1877, and the school located at Conover, and steps were taken to erect the necessary buildings on the present site of Concordia College. Conover had raised a subscription of near \$2,500 for the school buildings, Hickory about \$1,200, and Newton about \$800.

At this meeting at St. John's, according to record, were present Revs. P. C. Henkel, H. Goodman, M. L. Little and J. M. Smith; also Messrs. D. W. Moose, A. M. Huit, D. D. Seitz, Andrew Holler and others. At this meeting Dr. Henkel was chairman, J. M. Smith, secretary. Dr. Henkel was here elected president of the Board of Trustees of the school, and J. M. Smith, secretary of said Board.

Here we have the official record showing that the site was chosen at this meeting, and also that at that time no buildings were yet erected. The reader will note that Dr. Henkel was somewhat MORE PROMINENT in all these "high-handed, arbitrary" proceedings than Rev. Smith, as the records show. Dr. Henkel was the leading spirit at the meeting in Newton, at St. Paul's and at St. John's. Now, are Prof. Yoder and the Hickory men ready to repudiate Dr. Henkel as to this matter of college building? Are they ready to charge *him* with what they charge Rev. Smith? If Rev. Smith was a sinner in this matter, Dr. Henkel was also. But ; nowadays we are furnished the spectacle of certain Hickory pastors going about the country telling the people they are just the Lutherans Dr. P. C. Henkel was ! HENKELS is the name these men now take on their lips to

try to prove the Ohio doctrines of election and conversion, when they know full well that Dr. Henkel at the time of his death was corresponding with a view to getting a MISSOURIAN to come to North Carolina to take charge of work here! And now the public is treated to a "Situation in North Carolina," dealing with the school question, by a pretending friend of the late venerable Doctor with *no mention of the real founder of the school under consideration!* What does the candid reader think of such history?

Again Prof. Yoder says: "In 1889 the opposition to the school at Conover had to some extent been allayed because, in the meantime, Synod had taken it under its care."

Here we have the remarkable declaration that the great majority of the people of this county will chime in and help a school secured in a "high-handed and arbitrary" manner and fathered by a man guilty of "unchristian conduct," if only the Tennessee Synod will surround such a school with its "fostering wings." The year 1889 must be a memorable one in the history of the author of this pamphlet. If we mistake not, that is the same year Prof. Yoder went about telling people to give their money to the school at Conover, of which he was president. Prof. Yoder was along with Rev. Cline on canvassing tours for the college that year. Prof. Cline in that same year told the people that he too had once opposed Concordia College, but that he was wrong about it—that *Conover was the place* for the school, etc. Profs. Yoder and Cline do not come out now like men and say we were mistaken in our support of Conover school, say we were mistaken in 1889, say our whole past record in regard to Concordia College was a mistake, but they try to blacken and traduce the good names of those who have been, as they ought to say, too ignorant to see their mistake, as yet, in remaining at Conover. Calling other people bad names will cover up no sins those who attempt this method of defense may be guilty of.

And Dr. Fox is resurrected to testify for the defense!

Prof. Yoder forgets that he used to say hard things about Dr. Fox for being on the opposite side of Prof. Yoder as to this school question. It does make a great difference as to the *size* of some things, if the observer changes *places* during his observation!!

Prof. Yoder pays his respects to Conover and to the

called session of the Tennessee Synod at St. James, December 26-27, 1890, by calling Revs. Smith and Bernheim "un-christian" and by saying the Conover party forced a vote under "gag-law." The Hickory men claim that the proposition of Mr. J. G. Hall was not voted on, that Synod was called together for that purpose—to consider Hall's proposition. Perhaps it would be well to see just what the Hickory men wanted Synod to vote on. Here it is:

WHEREAS, Mr. J. G. Hall, of the city of Hickory, trustee of certain school and other property, lying in and near said city, has offered the same to our Synod, and

WHEREAS, An opportunity is thus afforded us to increase our school property and advantages, and

WHEREAS, We believe that the time has now come for us to begin to meet our responsibility to the orphans of our Synod, therefore

Resolved, That we accept the offer made by Mr. Hall, and use said property for our college, with its theological department.

2. That we accept the offer made us, by the board, of the property in the town of Conover, provide for the improvement of and addition to it, and the establishment of a home for the needy orphans of the Lutheran Church, and the perpetuation of a good academical school, upon the basis adopted by the original founders of said school.

3. That, in view of his untiring zeal and almost unequalled success in the propagation and defense of the pure doctrines of the Church, and especially that of infant church membership, thus making him pre-eminently the spiritual patron of the children, our institution at Conover be known as the P. C. HENKEL ORPHAN HOME AND ACADEMY, a living and useful memorial to the worth of him whose name it shall thus bear, and that our college retain its present name.

4. That both these institutions be controlled by the same board of directors, whose members shall all be members of our Synod, with the specified life-time exception of Mr. J. G. Hall.

5. That, with devout gratitude, we recognize, in our opportunities, the gracious provision of our heavenly Father, enabling us to begin to meet our responsibilities to the orphans, as well as to the youth of our dear old Synod.

Was Synod called together to establish ACADEMIES, ORPHAN ASYLUMS and the like? Had Synod voted on the above, would it have voted on what Synod was called together for, according to the Hickory men? Of course it would, and some other things, too! But when a SUBSTITUTE was voted on that destroys the validity of the action of a parliamentary body! Wonderful! Now, let the reader remember that the Conover men were willing to continue the debate on Monday, provided the names of some Conover men who could not be present at Synod during the next

week should on Saturday evening be recorded as voting in favor of Conover and against Hall's proposition. This the Hickory men refused to do. But yet the Conover men did not call for the substitute, locating the school permanently at Conover, until after the Rev. J. R. Peterson, the mover of the substitute, asked Prof. Yoder, the president of the school, whether the school could not be made a success at Conover. Prof. Yoder answered him that it *could be made a success at Conover*. Then, and only then, was the substitute offered and adopted by a majority of the Synod, counting those not voting as against the substitute. The majority of the Synod was against any further consideration of the Hall proposition, and disposed of the matter by voting on a substitute, which carried. Of course, the Hickory men will have to try to destroy the legality of that vote or they will have a bad case against themselves in not obeying the wishes of Synod. And if Prof. Yoder and his friends went to Hickory with no idea of establishing a school in opposition to the one at Conover, as he says, then why did he not insist on the students here in 1891 RETURNING here? But no, it had to be shown apparently to the world that Conover was not the place for the school or his actions would be questioned. The Hickory men let the school at Conover DIE two or three weeks before the annual closing, and all because, if we are to believe them, they wanted to "increase the school facilities of the Tennessee Synod!"

Prof. Yoder censures Rev. C. H. Bernheim for, as he says, trying to make a deal with Ohio before the Synod at St. James. It might be a pertinent question to ask why Bernheim did not do the giving away act, which Prof. Yoder seems to think he was so anxious to do. One reason was that Rev. Bernheim was not the whole Board of Trustees at any time "within the memory of men still living." And if those men, Smith and Bernheim, were so omnipotent in locating schools, and it is shown that they failed to deliver the goods to Ohio on this occasion, might not the reason be that it was because certain Lutherans about Conover did not agree with Ohio in doctrine, nor approve of the way Ohio got into North Carolina? Let it be said that so far as Rev. Bernheim's letter goes, he was not then writing for anybody but himself. But here is what Rev. Bernheim himself has to say about the matter :

"Yoder's charge against me on page 12, quoting a part of my letter, is of no weight whatever, because I THEN did not fully understand the difference between Missouri and Ohio. Neither did I at any time state that I never changed my views."

Then, again, Prof. Yoder tells how Revs. Smith and Bernheim opposed a proposition to leave the matter of location of Concordia College to a direct vote of the congregations of the Tennessee Synod, though they had, on January 13, 1891, agreed to such a scheme. But the public should remember that Revs. Smith and Bernheim acted thus because Synod a few weeks before had said the school should be at Conover, and to submit to a scheme of this kind would have been equivalent to opening anew the warfare—of disregarding the express action of Synod, a thing, no doubt, Prof. Yoder and others would have gladly witnessed. Prof. Yoder tells the public how the Board of Trustees of Concordia College and two MISSOURIANS called a pastor for Concordia congregation. Prof. Yoder knows that it was customary for one of the teachers in the college here to be pastor of Concordia congregation in order to enable him to receive a better salary. That recommendation did not amount to a call at all. Prof. Dau was called unanimously by Concordia congregation. No ELECTIONEERING was engaged in by anyone. The congregation wanted to call a MISSOURIAN and did so, because it had a perfect right to do so. And now we are told by some people that it was not DIVINE, because a professorship was coupled with it. Did not Prof. Yoder tell members of Concordia congregation to call Rev. J. G. Schaidt or they could "let the school go down?" Prof. Yoder was in the Board meeting that called Schaidt, and the record shows it, and also shows that "Prof. Yoder was to notify Rev. Schaidt of his call after the congregation acted." Prof. Yoder ought to be the last man to say anything about Prof. Dau's call.

Now, let us see HOW THE ENGLISH SYNOD OF MISSOURI OBTAINED CONTROL OF CONCORDIA COLLEGE.

Prof. Yoder says it was thus: 'The Missourians taking advantage of this disaffection in the Tennessee Synod, and aided by members of the Board of Trustees, who played the part of traitors to the Tennessee Synod, secured control of the school.'—[See page 19.]

Here MISSOURI is accused of taking advantage of a dis-

affection and of slyly creeping in at Conover.

The history is this : In the autumn of 1891 the Board of Trustees of Concordia College applied to Rev. F. Kuegele as president of the Eng. Synod of Missouri to aid them in securing teachers for the college. The proposition was made that Missouri supply a president for the institution, and that by holding Free Conferences an attempt be made to bring about an agreement between Tennessee and Missouri. No secret was made of this. President Kuegele wrote to New Market, the headquarters of the Tennessee Synod, about the matter. In December, 1891, Revs. Kuegele and Dallman came to Conover. Here it was agreed to grant the request of the Board and provide the school with a man to act as its president and as a professor in the same. This put the school AS SUCH under control of Missouri. As to the school property, it was mutually agreed that it should remain in the same hands as before. But before ratifying this agreement Revs. Kuegele and Dallman went to Hickory to inquire of the professors at Highland (now Lenoir) College, whether they could show Missouri valid reasons why Missouri should not supply teachers for Concordia College. The Hickory men showed Missouri no such reasons, neither did they warn Missouri away from Conover. Then, the agreement was finally ratified. From these historic facts it is clear :

1. Missouri did not creep in at Conover.
2. Before granting a teacher for Concordia College, Missouri made inquiry of the opponents and was not warned away from Conover, neither at Hickory nor at New Market. At Hickory one man expressed *fears* that the coming of Missouri would lead to complications, and that is all.
3. The members of the Board of Trustees are wrongfully accused of being traitors to the Tennessee Synod. From the above named agreement it is plain that there was no intention on the part of the Board nor on the part of Missouri to deprive the Tennessee Synod of property or rights. If such had been the intention, then the president of Concordia College would not, ten months later, have sent a report of the school to the convention of the Tennessee Synod at Hickory, by which act the fostering care of that Synod was acknowledged. Here it was that the Tennessee Synod itself withdrew its oversight of Concordia College and so cut loose from Conover. It is an error to say, as

Prof. Yoder does, that the Board of Trustees took the college away from the Tennessee Synod. The opposite is true—the Synod discarded the college. It was only after such action on the part of the Tennessee Synod that the Board took steps looking to a transfer of the property to Missouri. The charge of treason certainly comes with ill grace from the very men who DESERTED the work at Conover. But Prof. Yoder claims that the Minutes of Eng. Mo. Synod contain a wrong statement when they say: “The Tennessee Synod withdrew its fostering care from the institution, and the Board of Trustees applied to the Mission Board of the German Mo. Synod.” There is in these statements a wrong order, which by oversight remained in the minutes referred to above. This every one acquainted with the run of affairs can easily see. The last statement should be said first, and the truth will be told. Prof. Yoder’s attitude at present reminds us of the man who laid down the pasture fence and went off and neglected to watch and to keep the cattle in the pasture, and who, after the cattle had escaped, proceeded to say bad things about cattle that would not stay in the pasture where they belonged. No doubt, there are some men in Catawba county who are sorry now after they see all the disturbance they have made. Prof. Yoder by writing a pamphlet which attacks everybody whom he sees in sight, no doubt, wishes, and thinks thereby to pay the debt he owes his Synod in not preserving its peace.

If in this whole transaction of making an agreement with the Board of Trustees at Conover Missouri was at fault, her fault was this—that she placed too much confidence in the professions of love for Missouri so frequent with pastors of the Tennessee Synod, and therefore believed that an agreement between the Synods could be brought about. In this we were deceived and we are sorry for it.

MISSOURI PASTORS AND TENNESSEE SYNOD CONGREGATIONS.

The true believers in a Christian congregation, and through them the whole congregation have the right, under certain restrictions laid down in God’s Word, to call a minister, and it is the “Lutheran idea,” as well as Biblical doctrine, that “the pastor becomes such by virtue of his call from a congregation.” The injunctions in God’s Word, which the congregation must observe in extending a call, have reference solely and alone to the qualifications of the

person called and to his soundness in the faith. Within these limits the congregation is free to act and when such a call is directed to a candidate or pastor, it is his duty to accept, unless he can show by incontestable evidence that God would have him stay where he is, and that the congregation has simply misdirected the call, or sent it to the wrong person. If that cannot be done, he dare not, as has been said, turn a deaf ear to the cry for help. That the pastors of Missouri will take charge of all vacant congregations to which they have a regular, valid call, and thus heed the cry for help, cannot surely be taken amiss. Such a call must of course leave the pastor free to preach and act according to his conscience bound in God's Word. If in consequence, through the preaching of the Gospel pure and simple, the congregation learns to see the advisability of uniting with those who are then one with her in faith, and of severing her connection with those with whom she cannot agree in matters of doctrine, that is to be looked upon only as one of the results of a faithful pastor's ministrations. Where it is manifest that there are differences which can be composed, the congregation will take no steps to sever her connection with her old Synod. Where there are such differences, the separation should take place only after repeated efforts to compose them have been unsuccessful.

In the Missouri Synod it has never been a practice to hold a lien upon the church property in some way or other, so as to insure the adherence of the congregation to the Synod. In the minutes of the 15th General Assembly, in St. Louis, 1872—pages 60-61—we see how Missouri condemns “tyrannizing over consciences:”—

“We have never taught that a congregation only then had all the privileges of a true church when she belonged to a Synod. We have always advised our young preachers not to take their congregations as it were by storm (bestuermen) so that they join the Synod. * * We have always advised congregations not to write in their constitution : Our congregation shall always belong to the Missouri Synod. We have always said that we do not desire that, and that a congregation cannot and should not rely on any Synod, not even the Missouri Synod. * * When a congregation leaves our Synod we do not say on that account : She is now no longer Lutheran. * * Congregations are to remain in our Synod only for this reason, because they themselves see : It is prof-

itable for us to remain therein. We are there connected also externally with many brethren in the faith. Much can be done there for the kingdom of God, that could not otherwise be done. We ourselves say: If it should ever happen that our Synod should take up false doctrine or unionistic practice, then cheerfully sever your connection with her."

ST. MARTIN'S CONGREGATION, IREDELL CO., N. C.

In a letter written by Prof. Dau to the then president of the Tennessee Synod, Rev. J. Paul Stirewalt, to inform him of the call to St. Martin's congregation of Pastor Romoser, and asking him to do something towards allaying threatened trouble, he says:

"I do sincerely deplore that I cannot, at present, conscientiously become a member of the E. L. Tenn. Synod. It is, however, my earnest desire to unite myself with your Synod as soon as certain obstacles are removed. For it matters little to me what the appellation of the Synod is to which I belong, so long as it is a truly Lutheran Synod in doctrine and practice. The fact that the E. L. Tenn. Synod is at present connected with other Lutheran bodies whose Lutheranism I have grave reasons to regard as questionable and not genuine, causes me to stand aloof. Could representatives of the E. L. Tenn. Synod and the E. L. Synod of Missouri meet and jointly discuss the doctrines of our beloved Church, and could these discussions, by the help of God, be so blessed as to result in a public declaration that there is perfect unanimity in doctrine and practice between the two Synods, I should not hesitate any longer to apply for membership in the E. L. Tenn. Synod. Rumors are being circulated that the Missouri pastors are trying to cause a schism in the E. L. Tenn. Synod and capture a congregation or two. I disclaim any intentions of such a nature, and sincerely regret these reports. I have entered the precincts of your Synod in answer to a divine call and with no other mission in my mind than to preach the blessed Gospel and build our Lutheran Zion."

Hence, when trouble arose in St. Martin's congregation, it was not due to any action on the part of the Missourian, Prof. Dau, who was then already in Conover. Two calls regularly made out by the committees duly appointed for that purpose, from St. Martin's and Sharou congregations, had already been sent to candidate, Romoser, in St. Louis. Since these calls were very brief, Romoser, without declining, asked for a fuller and more comprehensive call.

Since haste was necessary in order to get this call to St. Louis in time, a more comprehensive call was written and signed by one of the members of the committee, Mr. R. F. Cline, with the consent of another member. In the mean time, due to OUTSIDE interference, dissension arose in the congregation, which caused Prof. Dau to hold an investigation. In the meeting it was moved and seconded that the call be ratified, to correct any irregularity that might be SUPPOSED to exist in this matter. "Now, then was the time for the opposition to show whether the pretended irregularity was their only and real objection; for if that had been the case, they might have cheerfully voted for the ratification. But the motion having been made, their principal speaker at once entered a solemn protest, declaiming loudly and bitterly against Missouri and insinuating all manner of vile things." At last the final vote was taken on ratification, and stood 23 for and 5 against. President Stirewalt called the attention of the Tenn. Synod, assembled in Hickory, 1892, to the matter (perhaps upon the strength of Prof. Dau's letter) and recommended that the matter be investigated. In spite of the efforts of a member of Synod, who claimed to have a letter in his pocket from the secretary of St. Martin's (though not as secretary,) Synod did "not deem synodical action necessary." Still the matter was kept stirred and the FACTION in the congregation sent a petition to the North Carolina Conference of the Tenn. Synod, urging some action. Conference appointed a committee, two members of which, Revs. J. R. Peterson and L. L. Lohr, who, having informed Pastor Romoser, met him and the congregation April 4, 1893. The result was that Pastor Peterson was inclined to think the call regular, while Pastor Lohr thought otherwise. Thus nothing was accomplished for those who were determined upon "some action." The subject was still agitated and Conference appointed another committee. This committee went to St. Martin's without ever having informed the pastor or even the congregation, and "from statements made by all parties" (?) learned this call was "irregular." That such opinion would have great weight with many of the members was only natural, since they had known and esteemed these committeemen for many years. Therefore, some of the members who had voted for ratifying the call yielded, and it was resolved by a vote of 31 to 22 on the part of the con-

gregation that the call was irregular, and Pastor Romoser was obliged to withdraw. The division still existing in the congregation, which Prof. Yoder deprecates so much, may perhaps appear in another light when some at least of those members who are not yet reconciled are heard to say: "It is our firm conviction that this congregation, by a majority of its members, did wrong in breaking the call extended to Pastor Romoser."

SHARON CONGREGATION, IREDELL CO., N. C.

As regards Sharon congregation, this congregation in its unity is a living refutation of the charges of irregularity made against the call. Not only was a congregational meeting held and a vote taken empowering the committee to call, but the congregation also appointed a committee to be present at the meeting of the investigating committee at St. Martin's in April, and instructed them to declare that "Sharon church was determined to hold to the call which she had extended to Prof. Romoser.

As for the constitution which Romoser is charged with having set aside, the facts are these: Let it be remarked that not a word was said about this constitution until after Rev. Romoser was in North Carolina. Then it began to be noised about that Sharon's constitution required the pastor to belong to the Tenn. Synod. The elders, with the pastor, resolved to investigate the matter, and Mr. Cline called upon Rev. Suttlemyre for what was claimed to be Sharon's constitution. A paper was given him, but when it was read to the congregation the members did not know whether it was their constitution or not, for the following reasons: The paper was the borrowed constitution of another church, and throughout there was found the name of another congregation, instead of Sharon. The necessary corrections had not been made in this paper, and the members did not know whether they had been made in other places or not. Furthermore, not a single member had signed the paper, as it itself demanded. In view of these facts, the members said they could not recognize the paper as their constitution. And in order to show their sentiments, the congregation on August 26, 1894, took formal action condemning in strong terms the statements made in Prof. Yoder's book with reference to Sharon church.

ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, CATAWBA COUNTY, N. C.

By authority of St. John's E. L. Congregation of Catawba county, N. C., we, the undersigned, herewith make the following

Statement:

On September 2, 1894, our pastor read to our congregation that portion of Prof. Yoder's pamphlet which relates to the calling of our present pastor. After some discussion it was resolved that the charges contained in said pamphlet be publicly answered, and that the council of our church be appointed to formulate this answer and have it published. In accordance with these resolutions we offer to the public the following:

On May 20, 1893, our congregation held a meeting for the purpose of electing a pastor to succeed the Rev. C. H. Bernheim, who had resigned the office to remove to Lexington, N. C., on account of the feeble health of his wife. This meeting had been duly announced before, and was well attended. By a rule of our constitution a number of our members would have been prevented from voting. A motion was, therefore, made and carried at the beginning of the meeting, that the rules of the congregation be temporarily suspended. By this motion the side which now complains that we have acted unfairly in the calling of our present pastor, was greatly benefitted; for had not this motion prevailed a number of them could not have voted at all. There were present at this meeting our then pastor, Rev. C. H. Bernheim, and Rev. J. M. Smith, both of whom are charged in the pamphlet of Prof. Yoder with "electioneering for a Missourian." The facts are these: Rev. C. H. Bernheim did in no wise betray that he sought to influence us in the choice of our pastor, and Rev. Smith was present principally to prevent his own election, as he had been informed that he would be chosen. None of those who have voted for our present pastor shall concede that they were in any wise coerced to do so; they voted with the utmost freedom, and they voted with an eye to the best interests of the congregation. There was "electioneering," if we may borrow Prof. Yoder's phrase, but that was on the other side. Mr. Silas Wike and Miss Sallie Herman (now Mrs. Holler) made it their business prior to the meeting to personally see some of our members and urge them to vote for

Prof. Yoder. There were placed in nomination for the pastorate of our congregation, Prof. Dau and Prof. Yoder. The first ballot resulted in 37 votes for the former and 16 for the latter. A motion was then offered to make Prof. Dau's call unanimous, which was done, only 6 voting against the motion. It soon became painfully manifest that the oppositionists were determined to create a disturbance. Soon after our congregation learned with great sadness that a new congregation was about to be organized out of those who would not accept the services of our present pastor, and that Prof. Yoder was serving these parties at Wike's school house. Thus it will be seen, that while our part of the congregation used all efforts to prevent a rupture in the congregation, the oppositionists in every possible way widened the breach which they had made in the beginning, and clearly showed that they would not listen to God's word, when brought to bear on them by our side. The climax was reached when the opposition petitioned the Tennessee Synod for advice and assistance. None of our members have ever been able to inspect the paper which contained the petition; all that we know of it is the portion quoted in the minutes of the Tennessee Synod of 1893, and again quoted in Prof. Yoder's pamphlet on page 23. The minutes of the Tennessee Synod make this petition emanate "from St. John's E. L. Congregation;" this should read "from a small minority of the congregation." We do not mean to blame our Synod for this, for Synod probably looked at the 37 signatures of this petition, and imagined that these signatures represented about the entire congregation. In this there was not a little deception practiced. In the first place we wish to state that the 37 members are not voting members, we cannot even say that they are communing members; or members in good standing, because we have never seen the paper. None of the gentlemen whom Prof. Yoder mentions as his informers on page 22, excepting Mr. Silas Wike, were consistent members of our congregation. Our opponents ought to publish the paper with all the signatures. The reason why we know that those 37 members are not all voting members is this: Mr. L. E. Warren, one of the signers of that paper, afterwards in a meeting of our congregation stated that he had signed the paper not knowing and understanding the contents thereof, that he was sorry he had permitted his name to be affixed to this paper and should like to have it

erased, if this could be done. At his house 2 more signatures were obtained, that of his wife and his mother-in-law, Mrs. Price. The latter lady related the following at Mr. Noah Brady's house: The petition was brought to her house and the bearer of the same read from it to prove that the Missouri Synod was teaching Calvinistic doctrine regarding election, and on the strength of that they had permitted their names to be affixed to the document.—Our congregation holds that the petitioners should first have tried to have the matter settled in our congregation before they carried it to Synod; and that, after Synod had appointed a committee to investigate this matter, the committee, at least, should have called our congregation and also the petitioners together, and after hearing both sides, should have rendered their decision. Our congregation patiently waited to hear from the committee, but so far in vain. Now, we learn from Prof. Yoder's pamphlet that the committee have already rendered their decision, without ever giving us a hearing, and have advised the petitioners to organize their own congregation. We claim that the committee have not discharged the duty imposed on them. We leave it to all impartial men to say how such action ought to be termed. In conclusion, we would say, that Prof. Yoder is wrong in claiming that the calling of our present pastor has divided our congregation. The truth is, that for ten years we have not had a pastor under whom we were more united than under the one we have now. There has been trouble in our congregation for at least ten years, and both Profs. Yoder, and Moser, who endorses the pamphlet of Prof. Yoder, know of them, for they were personally concerned in them. More might be said, but this will suffice.

N. E. SIGMON.
N. E. BRADY.
B. E. SMITH.
F. J. DELLINGER.
J. J. CLINE.

LUTHER'S CHAPEL CONGREGATION, GLEN ALPINE, N. C.

With regard to Luther's Chapel congregation at Glen Alpine, N. C., we offer the following facts:

Mrs. Edward Sigmon was not living at Glen Alpine at the time of Prof. Dan's call to the pastorate. Whatever, therefore, she said to Rev. Rudisill regarding the "condition" in the call, she must have been told by some one of the congre-

gation who was present at the calling. Mr. J. J. Sigmon, her father-in-law, whom Prof. Yoder mentions as present at the conversation between Rev. Rudisill and Mrs. Sigmon, and assenting to what Mrs. Edward Sigmon said, states the matter thus: "I remember the occasion, but I do not recollect the words that were spoken. But no matter what was said, it is not so that our pastor was called "under condition" that he join the Tennessee Synod; he expressed hopes of being able to join the Tennessee Synod after certain differences should have been adjusted, however, when we called him and handed him a written vocation, there were no conditions stipulated, except that he preach to us the word of God in accordance with our confessions, that he lead a christian life and faithfully discharge a pastor's duties among us."

In addition to this, the congregation at Glen Alpine offers the following testimony:

"After Prof. Schaid, our former pastor, had left us, we were unable to obtain a pastor for more than a year. We applied to Hickory, and were promised that we would be served, but that was all. Even appointments that had been made, were not filled. We then heard of the new professors at Conover, and our secretary wrote to Mr. P. C. Lail of Conover, describing our need and asking for a pastor. In consequence of this Prof. Dau visited us in June, 1892, and preached us a sermon. After the sermon a meeting of the voting members of our church was held to consider the calling of a pastor. Prof. Dau stated that he was not a member of the Tennessee Synod, and explained his reason for not joining our Synod at once; however, he hoped to do so whenever the Tennessee Synod should sever her present connection with the United Synod of the South, and he could be sure that he fully agreed with them. As to his serving our congregation he stated that if the congregation desired further service by him, they must extend a written call to him. This was agreed to; the call was given him, and he became our pastor. We cannot see how any one can find fault with the manner in which Prof. Dau came in to us, nor have we any complaints to make regarding his ministration among us."

J. D. HOKE.

J. J. SIGMON.

In conclusion, we refer to a very clear and strong paragraph on page 24 of Prof. Yoder's pamphlet reading: "In the outset they dictated terms upon which they would condescend

to connect themselves with the Tennessee Synod, such terms as would practically make the Tennessee Synod Missourians, *i. e.*, whenever the Tennessee Synod would withdraw from the United Synod of the South, and agree with them in doctrine and practice; of course, they would connect themselves then, when the Tennessee Synod would become Missourian."

Omitting the dictation part, this paragraph contains facts. No true Missourian can conscientiously belong to so mixed a body as is the United Synod of the South, and we want no outward union without unity. To bring about such unity free conferences were prepared and we would hail with joy the arranging of such conferences, but we cannot and do not mean to dictate them.

ARE THE MISSOURIANS PROSELYTERS?

On page 25 of Prof. Yoder's pamphlet we read: "Missouri is regarded as a disturbing and proselyting Synod, not only here, but also at other places."

Yes, Missouri has been denounced as a disturbing element in America and Europe, in Asia and Australia, and in Africa; and now in these last times Prof. Yoder joins the chorus. Let us remind him that the Thessalonians knew how to make the same charge, for of Paul and Silas they declared: These that have turned the world upside down have come hither also, (Acts 17:6).

Prof. Yoder also goes to some pains to quote what *others* say of Missouri, whom he claims are uninterested witnesses. Now, as Solomon has somewhere told us to "let another man praise thee and not thine own lips," we beg to be excused from presenting encomiums on Missouri. However, it would be an easy matter to do so, even from the minutes and church paper of Prof. Yoder's own Synod. Then Prof. Yoder says Dr. Henkel never belonged to the English Mo. Synod. Of course not. But he belonged to and was one of the founders of the English Mo. Conference, which afterwards was organized into the English Mo. Synod! And if it is said that the spirit of the English Mo. Synod of today is meddlesome and abominable, then the heads of its founders should bear the odium of bringing into being such a body. But Dr. Henkel's labors in this connection have been commended by both Tennessee and Missouri.

On page 26 of his pamphlet, Prof. Yoder quotes Har-
old & Zeitschrift, April 1, 1893, to show that even in the
Synodical Conference, the general body to which the Mo.
Synod belongs, there is a feeling against Missouri. Those
who wish to investigate the truthfulness of this quotation
and find out what the Wisconsin Synod has to say as to
this fuss, can find a reply to this very quotation of the Pro-
fessor's by consulting the *Gemeindeblatt*, No. 1, 1893. This
paper is the official organ of the Wisconsin Synod, and it
takes strong grounds against those who publish articles
like the one Prof. Yoder quotes. But for the benefit of
those who may not have an opportunity to see the reply
in question we shall quote a few words from it: "Finally,
the union is not intended to isolate Missouri and to begin
the work of dissolving the Synodical Conference, for, in
virtue, the Synodical Conference has experienced an in-
crease by the entrance of the Synod of Michigan, formerly
not of that body."

Here we have the statement from the official organ of the
Wisconsin Synod to the effect that Wisconsin does not de-
sire to isolate Missouri, which would seem to mean that she
has yet a sisterly affection for her sister Synod of Missouri
and does not wish it discontinued.

And yet, Prof. Yoder asks who these Missourians are,
who these disturbers of the church are, and what manner
of men they are! Why, indeed, they are the *same* men Dr.
Henkel tried to get into North Carolina long ago; they are
the *same* men he co-operated with in founding the English
Missouri Conference, afterwards the English Synod of
Missouri; they are the *same* men Dr. Socrates Henkel says
are very respectable people, and finally they are the *very*
same men whom Prof. Yoder labors in a 50 page pamphlet
to misrepresent and villify by quoting Nicum, Ohio, and
other unreliable sources of information.

Finally, the Missourians in North Carolina are not
proselyters as the following facts will show:

1. Missouri did not come to North Carolina discussing
election and raising a fuss, but Prof. Yoder circulated a
report in advance of Prof. Dau's coming to the effect that
Missouri was Calvinistic, and Prof H. K. Doermann of the
Ohio Synod had circulated the report that he would chal-
lenge Prof. Dau to debate election as soon as the Missou-
rian should arrive here. Missouri was drawn into this

discussion of election unwillingly. She had hoped to agree with Tennessee.

2. Prof. Dau advised Concordia congregation over one year ago, when it wished to withdraw from the Tennessee Synod to remain in the Tennessee Synod as long as there was any hope of Missouri and Tennessee getting together. And Prof. Dau and the congregation are *still* waiting almost against hope.

3. Missouri has never attempted to get students for Concordia College in Tennessee. Congregations unfriendly to Missouri. When students from such congregations have applied for admission, they, however, have been admitted.

4. Every sermon on election preached in North Carolina by Missouri pastors has been by *request*. Missouri practices the directions of Paul and the Book of Concord in presenting this doctrine. She does not preach *election* to the exclusion of other doctrines.

5. Missouri *does not today own the college property at Conover*. Though the Board of Trustees offered it to Missouri, Missouri advised them to wait to see whether Missouri and Tennessee could not sometime soon unite in church work here in North Carolina.

6. Missouri has been careful not to distribute broadcast her literature, as is the practice of Ohio in this section. Missouri has confined her work to those congregations over which Missouri pastors have the oversight, or those in fellowship with them. Tennessee pastors have been sent copies of pamphlets setting forth our doctrine of election. The distribution of our literature in congregations unfriendly to us has never been practiced by Missouri in North Carolina.

7. And after all that Prof. Yoder can or may say, it is true that the Missouri Synod has not added *one church, one pastor*, or one church member to its fold on account of the presence and work of Missouri in North Carolina. This is true to date, Sept. 15, 1894.

Does any candid reader believe Missouri would have acted thus, if she was here in North Carolina to proselyte Lutherans? The actions of Missouri are a *standing refutation of this charge* of Prof. Yoder.

"MISSOURI'S DOCTRINE OF ELECTION."

In his fourth chapter Prof. Yoder endeavors to prove our doctrine of election Calvinistic. We herewith give to the kind reader our Synod's final confession on this doctrine as adopted at Ft. Wayne in 1880.

CONFESSION OF THE SYNOD OF MISSOURI ON THE DOCTRINE OF PREDESTINATION.

"1. We believe, teach and confess, that God loved the whole world from eternity, created all men unto salvation, none unto damnation, and that He earnestly wills the salvation of all men; and we therefore reject and condemn with all our heart the contrary Calvinistic doctrine.

"2. We believe, teach and confess, that the Son of God came into the world for all men, that He bore and expiated the sins of all men, and that He fully redeemed all men, none excepted; we therefore reject and condemn the contrary Calvinistic doctrine with all our heart.

"3. We believe, teach and confess, that God calls through the means of grace all men earnestly, that is, with the purpose that they should, through these means, be brought to repentance and faith, also be preserved therein unto their end, and thus be finally led to blessedness, conformable to which purpose God offers them through the means of grace the salvation wrought by Christ's atonement and the power to embrace this salvation by faith; and we therefore reject and condemn the contrary Calvinistic doctrine with all our heart.

"4. We believe, teach and confess, that no one perishes, because God was not willing that he be saved, passed him by with His grace; and because He had not also offered him the grace of perseverance and was not willing to bestow the same upon him. But all men that perish, perish because of their own fault, because of their unbelief and because they contumaciously resisted the Word and grace unto their end. The cause of this contempt of the Word is not God's foreknowledge, (*vel praescientia vel praedestinatio*,) but man's perverted will which rejects or perverts the means and the instrument of the

Holy Spirit, which God offers unto it through the call, and it resists the Holy Spirit who would be efficacious and operate through the Word, as Christ says: Matth. 23:37, How often would I have gathered you together, and ye would not. (*Form. of Concord* p. 718, §41.) Therefore we reject and condemn the contrary Calvinistic doctrine with all our heart.

"5. We believe, teach and confess, that the elect or predestinated persons are only the true believers, who truly believe unto their end or yet at the end of their life; we reject therefore and condemn the error of Huber, that election is not particular, but universal and pertains to all men.

"6. We believe, teach and confess, that the divine decree of election is unchangeable and that therefore no elect person can become a reprobate and perish, but that every one of the elect will surely be saved: and we therefore reject and condemn the contrary Huberian error with all our heart.

"7. We believe, teach and confess, that it is foolish and soul-endangering, leads either to carnal security or despair to endeavor to become or be sure of our own election or eternal happiness by means of searching out the eternal secret decree of God; and we reject and condemn the contrary doctrine as an injurious fanatic notion with all our heart.

"8. We believe, teach and confess, that a true believer ought to endeavor to become sure of his election from God's revealed will; and we therefore reject and condemn with all our heart the opposite Papistical error, that one may become or be sure of his election and salvation only by means of a new immediate revelation.

"9. We believe, teach and confess: 1. That election does not consist in the mere fact that God foresaw which men will secure salvation; 2. That election is also not the mere purpose of God to redeem and save men, which would make it universal and extend in general to all men; 3. That election does not embrace those 'which believe for awhile' (Luke 8:12.) 4. That election is not a mere decree of God to lead to bliss all those who would believe unto their end; we therefore reject and condemn the opposite errors of Rationalists, Huberians and Arminians with all our heart.

"10. We believe, teach and confess, that the cause which moved God to elect, is alone His grace and the merit of Jesus Christ, and not anything good foreseen by God in the elect, not even faith foreseen in them by God; and we therefore reject and condemn the op-

posite doctrines of the Pelagians, Semi-Pelagians and Synergists as blasphemous, dreadful errors which subvert the Gospel and therefore with the whole Christian religion.

"11. We believe, teach and confess, that election is not the mere divine foresight or prescience of the salvation of the elect, but also a cause of their salvation and of whatever pertains to it; and we therefore reject and condemn the opposite doctrines of the Arminians, Socinians, and of all Synergists with all our heart.

"12. We believe, teach and confess, that God has also concealed and kept secret many things concerning the mystery of election and reserved them for His wisdom and knowledge alone, into which no human being is able and ought to search; and we therefore reject every attempt to inquire curiously also into these things which have not been revealed, and to harmonize with our reason those things which seem contradictory to our reason, may such attempts be made by Calvinistic, or Pelagianistic Synergistic doctrines of men.

"13. We believe, teach and confess, that it is not only not useless, much less injurious, but necessary and salutary that the mysterious doctrine of election, in so far as it is clearly revealed in God's Word, be presented also publicly to Christian people, and we therefore do not agree with those who hold that entire silence should be kept thereon, or that its discussion should only be indulged in by learned theologians."

C. A. F. Tr.

With this "Confession" Synod, at the same time, issued the following directions :

With these 13 theses we do not connect any other meaning than that suggested by the words in their native sense. Anyone who really accepts these theses, as they read, is one with us in faith. We confess that in these theses there is laid down the sum and substance of what we believe regarding the eternal election of God. At the same time we herewith state that we do not agree to anything that is not in harmony with these theses, EVEN IF IT WERE FOUND IN OUR OWN PUBLICATIONS. WE KNOW OF NO SECRET OR HIDDEN MEANING IN THESE THESES.—Min. Gen. Syn. of Mo., 1881, p. 37. [Emphasized passages our own.]

Prof. Yoder will grant that the author of a book is the best interpreter of that book. If he cannot harmonize the quotations from our publications, which he has somewhere discovered, we advise him to throw them away and devote himself ENTIRELY to the 13 theses. As to those quotations on pages 30 and 31 of his pamphlet, he himself states that he obtained them "not from the original," because he "did

not have them on hand." It is a question with us, whether Prof. Yoder did ever read one entire article in those of our publications from which he quotes. If he does not consider it worth while to convince himself of the truth of what he quotes, if he accepts garbled statements which others put into his hand, does he really expect us to answer him? The best answer which we could make to his quotations and the hideous errors which he deduces therefrom, imputing them to us as part of our faith, would be to simply reproduce those entire articles from which he quotes. And if the Lord spares our life we shall do so, and were it for no other purpose but to convince Prof. Yoder that he is misrepresenting us with the assistance of Ohio.

However, we shall note some important objections to our doctrine, which Prof. Yoder raises. Quoting our X Thesis he "calls attention to the fact that 'faith' is *excluded*" in the same. (p. 29.) YES, so IT IS! *And woe to the Lutheran who should include faith in such a thesis!* For, the thesis speaks of "*the cause which moved God to elect*" Does our Book of Concord mention faith as a *cause* of election? Prof. Yoder quotes copiously from the Form of Concord, but he has *not one quotation to show that faith is "included" among the causes of election.* The Form of Concord, Epitome, XI Art., rejects the following error; viz: "That the mercy of God, and the most holy merit of Christ, are NOT the ONLY cause of the election of God, but that in us also there is a cause, on account of which God has elected us to eternal life."—(New Mark, 2 Ed., p. 586.) In this paragraph our Church also "excludes" faith, and it is now for Prof. Yoder to reject the Confessions of our Church, for the same reason that he rejects our X Thesis: they both "exclude" faith as a cause of election.

By Prof. Yoder's remark on our X Thesis the impression is left on unwary minds that Missouri teaches an election without faith; at least Prof. Yoder was not kind enough to point out in the quotation which he makes from Prof. Pieper's book, that we teach an election which includes faith. We, therefore, "call attention to this fact." And to throw further light on this point we offer the following from our publications:

Dr. Walther said at Chicago in 1880:

"If it is said that God elected those of whom he foresaw that that they would finally believe, THAT IS CORRECT. However, as

soon as one says: He elected them, BECAUSE He foresaw that they would finally believe, THAT IS FALSE.—(Minutes, etc., p. 501.)

Prof. Hoeckhardt :

"It is the same whether we say: God decreed to save by FAITH each and every person of the elect, or: God has predestinated TO FAITH and salvation each and every person of the elect. In this case faith represents the intermediate, salvation the ultimate end of the election of God."—(L. u. W. 1880, p. 235.)

Prof. Yoder has been at some pains to establish harmony between the canons of the Synod of Dort and our publications. Now, we should very much like to see Calvin's followers abandon that doctrine of which their master himself professed that it is a "horrible" doctrine (Calv. Inst. III, 237;) however, on the strength of what Arts. IX and X of the Canons of Dort say regarding election, we cannot yet strike hands with them; just as little as we could unite with the Church of Rome, because it also teaches that the bread and wine in the Eucharist ARE (not signifying) the body and blood of Christ. However, this manœuvre of Prof. Yoder, too, is old. Pres. Beyer of the Eastern Dist. of our Synod, in his opening address at York, Pa., in 1832 has an elaborate treatise on this question: What answer shall we make to the charge which is raised against us—viz., that we are Krypto-Calvinists? (i. e., Calvinists in disguise.) He takes up our thirteen theses in their order and by offering counter testimony from Calvinistic writers and churches on the main points of difference between them and us, shows to the satisfaction of any impartial mind that the charge of Calvinistic tendencies in our doctrine is, to say the least, unfounded. We kindly ask Prof. Yoder to study this address. In addition we offer the following:

Prof. Pieper :

The constellation, at present, is odd. Formerly Calvinistic errors in the article concerning predestination were fought, over against those who placed a predestination unto damnation alongside of the predestination unto salvation, who denied the universality of the gracious will of God, of the merit of Christ, of the serious efficacy of the means of grace. WE do not place a predestination unto damnation alongside of the predestination unto salvation; WE teach a gracious will of God which seriously extends to all, a perfect redemption through Christ that is universal, a serious effect of the Word of God upon the hearts of all whose ears are reached by the sound of the gospel. WE also teach that the grace of perse

verance is offered to all who have come to faith, so that, if a person is lost, he has brought damnation upon himself, solely by his resistance to the operation of the Holy Spirit in the Word and Sacraments, and that IN OPPOSITION to the gracious will of God. However, we reject as unscriptural and unconfessional that definition of election which represents it as having taken place in consequence of foreseen faith. We, on the contrary, contend that, according to the Scriptures and the Confessions, the faith which is wrought in time and, in general, the entire spiritual life of those who are saved, are to be placed in such a relation to election that election can and must justly be called a CAUSE of faith and of spiritual life.—(L. & W., vol. 27, p. 4.)

The Synod teaches a doctrine of predestination which disregards the work of our Saviour. The X Art. which Prof. Yoder quotes leaves out Christ entirely; nor does Art. IX refer to Him. What do OUR people say?

Dr. Walther in the much-abused Minutes of the West Dist. of 1877, p. 25, is put on record thus :

"In this connection it must be noted, too, that the apostle (Eph. 1:3-6) expressly says, we are elected BY JESUS CHRIST; therefore, it is a wicked doctrine to say that first election took place with God in eternity, and then He prevailed upon His Son, so to speak, to execute this decree of His. On the contrary, CHRIST is the eternal foundation, and because and, humanly speaking, after God the Father willed to surrender His dear Son for the lost sinful world, therefore, and not before that, He could, without ceasing to be God, elect all those who should believe in His Son unto the end."

Prof. Yoder is in a sore plight. He wants faith included among the causes of election; that the Lutherans will not do for him, nor even the Calvinists. Who will? Only men who have discarded the old, glorious banner-truth of the Evangelical Lutheran Church—viz, *Soli Deo Gloria!*—i. e., "All glory be to God alone;" men who can teach that, in man's conversion and salvation, "much, yea rightly understood, ALL depends upon the conduct of man;" these and only these will accept Prof. Yoder's doctrine of election in view of foreseen faith.

PROF. YODER AND THE "FATHERS."

Having failed to prove his doctrine of election in view of foreseen faith from the Book of Concord, Prof. Yoder, on page 34 of his pamphlet, begins to appeal to the "Fathers." He

writes: "If fathers are to be considered, let us consider *fathers*. All these theologians teach '*in view of faith*,' as the correct interpretation of the Confessions." We ask: Who requires Prof. Yoder to "consider fathers"? Missouri's teachers do not claim to be fathers, as Prof. Yoder asserts. Their doctrine is that of the Confessions, not of the fathers. However, Prof. Yoder *needs* the "fathers;" the *expression* '*in view of faith*' occurs in the private writings of many Lutheran theologians (*not all*); it does not occur in the Bible, nor in the Confessions.

That the writings of the "fathers" cannot be binding upon us, Prof. Yoder seems to concede; he looks upon them as "interpreters" of the Confessions. This may seem harmless, yet it is a dangerous position for a Lutheran to occupy, especially when the "fathers" are adduced to *decide* what is the real sense of the Confessions. In that case, we should be bound to the Confessions *as the theologians of our Church have interpreted them*. THIS IS UNLUTHERAN; this is reviving the old popish error of traditions. We will accept of the service of our great theologians when they offer us their learning, the fruits of their busy and untiring studies, and thank God that he has blessed our church with such men; but they can never decide for us what our Confessions teach; that we decide for ourselves *from the very Confessions*. Prof. Yoder mistakes us when he imagines that we are "interpreting" the Confessions, we are simply restating them; we would not, for aught in this world, bind any one to what *we* say; but we bind our people to the Confessions "*in rebus et phrasibus*," *i. e.*, both in regard to the facts stated there and the manner of stating them. We do not write upon our banner an extra-confessional expression, such as "*in view of faith*" and make that one shibboleth. How were our people to judge of the correctness of our teaching, if in case of doubt or dispute, we were to refer to the interpretations of the fathers? They have not read the works of the "fathers" and the great majority of them cannot be expected to have read them, because they are written in a foreign language. Prof. Yoder simply deceives himself when he declares he will not be bound by the fathers: he actually does bind himself to them in this controversy, for he cannot hope to make good his case, except with the "fathers." And even then, all that he can prove by a number of them, is that they used the same phrase which

he has adopted, however, connecting with it quite a different meaning from his.

Prof. Yoder writes: "*All* these theologians teach 'in view of faith.'" This is bold. We doubt whether Prof. Yoder even *knows the names* of "*all*," much less do we believe that he has even *seen* the writings of *all*, and still less, that he has *read* them *all*. We have read only a few, and would despair if we were to prove our doctrine by "*all* these theologians." Here are a few specimens:

Hutter, the same authority whom Prof. Yoder quotes, writes in his 'Explanation of the Book of Concord' page 1101: "We readily concede that neither faith nor the foreknowledge of faith is the cause of our election." This statement would seem to cast the first gloom over Prof. Yoder's pretended unanimity of the "fathers" on the doctrine of "foreseen faith." Prof. Yoder desires that faith be "included" among the causes of election; ergo, Prof. Yoder ought henceforth to have no use for *Hutter*.

Musaeus in 1680—a hundred years after the final adoption of the Book of Concord—also claims that *all* theologians up to his day have taught the doctrine of in view of faith; "but," says he, "what kind of a relation to the decree of predestination foreseen faith represents, whether that of a cause, or that of a condition to be fulfilled on the part of the subject of predestination, or another?—on this question they have, for many years entertained *various ideas, nor have they been able to fully agree on the TERMS and PHASES by which this relation might be most fitly described and expressed.*"—(Comp. L. W. W. Vol. 16, page 50.) Here we even have a "father" that says the "fathers" have not agreed among themselves as to the best way of expressing their opinions. This is bad for Prof. Yoder's claim: "*All* these theologians, &c."

But the practical value of adopting *all* these theologians will appear still more questionable, by the following illustration:

Chemnitz, one of the authors of the Form of Concord writes:

"The election of God does not follow after our faith and righteousness, but precedes the same, being the efficient

Quenstedt, a Lutheran theologian, writes:

"That the consideration of faith, in the view of the divine mind, preceded the decree of salvation, or *which is the same thing*, that men who

cause thereof."—Echiridon, page 210, sec. 9. | should continue in faith in Christ, were elected, is proven, &c., &c.—Quoted in Luthern Standard, June 19, 1880.

Let the attentive and patient reader ponder the respective contents of these two counter statements always remembering Prof. Yoder's sweeping assertion: "*All* these theologians, &c., &c. Surely, between Chemnitz and Quenstedt, the agreement on the "in view of faith" doctrine, is rather misty. Like the church steeple which the little boy described, it takes, at least, two stout men to see it. Our farmers with their broad common sense when they read over these two quotations, will shake their heads and declare that "these here 'fathers' are rather somewhat agin each other."

And another illustration, which makes matters even worse than those preceding. We quote two definitions from Quenstedt:

Predestination

- (1.) is an act of the divine will,
- (2.) by which God, before the foundations of the world were laid,
- (3.) not according to our works,
- (4.) but from mere compassion.
- (5.) according to his purpose and good pleasure which he purposed in himself,
- (6.) in view of Christ's merits to be apprehended by faith.
- (7.) ordained unto eternal life,
- (8.) men who by the power of the Holy Ghost,
- (9.) through the preaching of the gospel,
- (10.) perseveringly and finally.
- (11.) would believe in Christ,

Reprobation

- (1.) is an act of the most free will of the triune God,
- (2.) by which He before the foundations of the world were laid,
- (3.)
- (4.) from righteous vindictior justice,
- (5.)
- (6.) on account of foreseen final rejection of Christ's merits,
- (7.) determined to damn to eternity,
- (8.) those who by their own fault,
- (9.)
- (10.)
- (11.) are fitted to destruction.

(12.) unto the praise of his glorious grace.	}	(12.) to the praise of his glorious justice.
---	---	---

In order to facilitate comparison we have divided these definitions and arranged their corresponding terms in parallel columns. The Lutheran reader will, on first view, be somewhat bewildered by this exhibition. What! he will exclaim, do these fathers, then, teach a twofold predestination?—Yes, dear reader, so they do. We can refer also to Baier, who in his *Positive Theology*, has the same arrangements, (Ed. Walther III, page 601, 2-8) to Hollaz, (*Exam. Theol*, P. III, 22-75), to Koenig, (*Nucleus Theol. Pos.* p. 338-362), &c. Such an arrangement we do not find in our Confessions, and our Lutheran theologians have here gone too far for the common reader. If they are to be regarded as “interpreters” of the Confessions and their “interpretations” endorsed, there ought to be an explanation given, at least at this place. Our Lutheran Church teaches only one gracious predestination of believers unto life, not a corresponding just predestination of unbelievers unto death. Ohio removes the difficulty in the following heroic manner: “The *dogmatical* use of the terms predestination and election accords with the truth and is useful for the systematic presentation of the doctrine, but it is not available for practical purposes.” (Luth. Standard 38, p. 170, col. 1.) This means: The dogmaticians speak of election in a manner that learned professors can understand them, but our common people must take a back seat when they offer their “systematic presentation.” Accordingly, Prof. Stelhorn in the tract in which he enlightens the public on “What is the real question in the present controversy on predestination?” with a coolness that is admirable, begins thus: “In this controversy, quite a number of points have been touched and discussed, that are *somewhat difficult to be grasped and understood by the average Christian, unless he possesses an especially penetrating mind and good christian knowledge.*”

However, the climax is reached when the “fathers” declare that they do not agree with the Form of Concord. Thus writes Loescher, *Theol. thet.* p. 258: “The word predestination has indeed a wider signification, yet not in the Bible, but in the Symbolical books. Therefore we again distinguish between the Symbolical and the Biblical meaning. That is a wide, this a narrow one. That has no place here, *except to relegate it*; for we expound this doctrine out of the Scrip-

tures." Here the exposition which our Form of Concord gives of the Bible doctrine of Election is pronounced unbiblical by a "father." Enough said. We truly hope that Prof. Yoder will henceforth couple better foresight with his zeal in the defense of the doctrines of our Church. Human authority is never altogether reliable.

Prof. Yoder also quotes from *Dr. Aug. Pfeiffer's "Anti-Calvinism,"* and on page 37 states how highly this book was recommended in this country some years ago. It will be a great surprise to Prof. Yoder to read that Missouri, too, hailed the publication of this book with delight. We append the "Review" of this book as it appeared in the "St. Louis Theological Monthly" of May, 1881, page 15:

"St. Paul writes that once there were some who preached Christ, supposing to add afflictions to his bonds; but he adds, Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence, or in truth, Christ is preached; and I therein do rejoice, yea, and will rejoice." (Phil. 1: 15-19.) Of these words of the holy Apostle we were reminded, immediately on seeing brave *A. Pfeiffer's* Anti-Calvinism in a new garb, we mean, in an English translation. Under present circumstances we at once surmised that this book owed its reappearance principally to the wish, it might serve as a weapon against us in the controversy on Predestination which has lately arisen. We were not, indeed, deceived. The new introduction confirms, distinctly enough, what we conjectured. *Nevertheless, we gladly welcome the book.* We are confident that many of those who will peruse it for the very reason of its being intended to add affliction to us, will in this way get a relish for the old Lutheran theology. Dr. Pfeiffer in this book has thoroughly and victoriously refuted the errors which are characteristically calvinistic. In his presentation of the Lutheran doctrine of Predestination he follows, indeed, the form of doctrine introduced into our Church by Aegidius Hunnius, and which represents God's eternal election as having been made intuitu fidei (i. e. in view of faith). But in this work of his he himself offers sufficient aid for the attentive reader who holds fast to our Confession, to easily correct him on this point by his own words. *We, therefore, embrace this opportunity of recommending the book to the English reading public."*

Lastly, *Dietrich* is called upon the witness-stand to testify against us. It is said that at Conover last January we failed

to express ourselves on his catechism; although other speakers offered to give their time to Prof. Dau, that he might make answer. How is this? Prof. Dau can show from the paper which he used at that conference, and on which he jotted down the points on which to speak, that he was ready then to make answer as to Dietrich's catechism. Rev. Smith once offered him his time, but as soon as this was done Prof. Cline protested, and to equalize matters, Prof. Cline offered his time to Prof. Doermann. Seeing that his opponents thought that he was taking advantage of them, Prof. Dau refused to accept Rev. Smith's offer, and took his seat. A great noise has been made about this matter which we now hope to hush forever.

WHAT DOES J. C. DIETRICH'S CATECHISM TEACH ON ELECTION ?

Repeatedly have we Missourians been asked : Do you endorse what Dietrich's Catechism teaches on election? It seems very strange indeed that we should be required to give an answer to such a question, when it is so well known a fact that we use this catechism in all our churches and schools for the instruction of our own children. But also Prof. Yoder in his pamphlet, p. 38, says: "Also Dietrich's Catechism which they (Missouri) have used for thirty years or more, and whose teaching on election they for a long time endorsed, *but will not do so now*, although they continue to use it in their school and catechetical classes in this section, teaches this same 'in view of faith' doctrine." As such unfounded assertions are spread out in public print we will here give a clear and unmistakable answer to the above question, and our answer is this: *We fully endorse Dietrich's Catechism, as in other points so also in the article of election, as teaching correct doctrine*, and we repudiate the assertion that this catechism teaches an election in foresight of faith. Let us see what this catechism does teach on election. Into what relation the catechism places election and the creation of faith is clear from question 281 :

"Why is He called the Holy Spirit ?

"Because He is the author of true holiness, and truly sanctifies all the elect."

Here the word sanctification comprises the whole work of the Holy Ghost for man's salvation, of course also the kindling and preserving of faith, and election is placed be

fore sanctification. It is presented as a cause from which sanctification is consequent. The catechism here speaks of election like Acts 13:48—"As many as were ordained to eternal life believed." They were ordained to eternal life, and so they believed, and the text does not say they believed and so were ordained to eternal life. The catechism does not say those who are sanctified He elects, but contrariwise, those who are elect He sanctifies. According to this answer sanctification flows from election, and not election from sanctification, and this excludes the idea of election in view of faith. So from the very first question in which the catechism touches on election it is certain that this book does not teach an election in foresight of faith. And in this teaching the catechism is consistent throughout.

Ques. 321.—"What then is the divine election of grace ?

"It is that act of God by which He, according to the purpose of His will, alone out of His grace and mercy in Christ, has resolved to save all those who shall steadfastly believe in Christ, to the praise of His glorious grace."

Besides assigning the causes of election the catechism here says who the elect are—namely, the believing Christians, and not the unbelieving, but it is not said because God foresaw that men would believe, therefore He elected them. To so construe the words is corrupting them and making the catechism contradict itself; for the next question reads :

"What is the nature of that decree of God, according to which He has resolved to save those who believe in Christ ?

"It is not unconditional, but is so fixed, according to a certain order, as to embrace all the causes and means of our salvation."

The causes and means, according to question 323, are God's mercy, Christ's merits, and persevering faith. So the catechism includes faith in the elective act as an integral part of it and this excludes the idea of an election in view of faith, because that doctrine presents faith as not being included in the decree of election, but makes it the OUTSIDE RULE by which God was guided and enabled to make a "rational" choice. Such doctrine as that God must have a rule by which He is guided and enabled to make a rational choice is entirely foreign to Dietrich's Catechism. This is still more evident from question 325 :

"Whence is it then that not all and every person, for whom these means of salvation are designed, is equally chosen to eternal life ?

"It is because God has purposed not to elect them absolutely and unconditionally, but with this appointment and in this order, that they should through the Gospel believe in Jesus Christ, and by true faith in Him be saved. But because the greatest number do not believe, it necessarily follows that only those who believe unto the end, and, therefore, but few are chosen."

The catechism does not say because they did believe, neither does it say because God foresaw that they would believe. In clear, strong words it says, "THAT THEY SHOULD believe." The catechism teaches election as unto salvation, so also unto faith as the means of appropriating salvation. And that this is biblical language is demonstrated by Eph. 2:10: "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." In His election God ordained the elect to walk in good works, and hence to a walk in faith, without which no man can do good works.

Let the reader pick up the catechism and examine for himself what it teaches. We Missourians FULLY ENDORSE DIETRICH'S CATECHISM. It is our catechism. And yet we will not be bound to Dietrich, because we will not be bound to the writings of any man, living or dead, save only the Bible and the Confessions.

In this connection we must also note that Dietrich's Catechism does not teach a conditional election, as Prof. Yoder's pamphlet on pages 46 and 47 so emphatically does. In question 322 it says:

"It is not unconditional, but is so fixed, according to a certain order, as to embrace all the causes and means of our salvation."

The catechism rejects an unconditional election, yet does not say that election is conditional, but describes it as "so fixed, according to a certain order." That is something very different from teaching a conditional election. Nowhere does the catechism call faith the condition of election, but it very distinctly teaches that faith is the free gift of God, and hence it does not regard faith as a condition which man must fulfill before he can be chosen to eternal life.

Ques. 283—"Can no one in his conversion to God do anything of his own power?"

"Not at all, for just on this account I believe that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ my Lord, or come to Him."

Ques. 286—"Whence then does conversion to God and faith in Jesus Christ come ?

"It is a gracious gift of the Holy Ghost, who works both in us by His mighty power."

After making these positive and unqualified statements the catechism cannot further on teach a conditional election without contradicting itself. In this point also we Missourians fully endorse Dietrich's Catechism.

Yet we do not accuse a man of teaching wrong simply and only because he uses the expression, faith is the condition in election, because a man may connect a right meaning with this expression. We distinguish between a condition which God Himself fulfills and between a condition which man must comply with. If a man says, God's election is conditioned by that faith which God Himself creates, preserves and finishes, that is clearly not teaching wrong—it is only using language in which there is very little meaning. If I say, I choose these men to be soldiers under condition that they are furnished with a grey coat which I myself provide them, every one will easily see that there is no real condition made there, because I myself both make AND FULFILL the condition. I might as well say, I will take these men and dress them in grey and make them soldiers. But it becomes something very different if I say, I will choose men to be my soldiers under condition that they are dressed in grey. Then the meaning implied is that I do not furnish them the grey suit—they must do it themselves. That is stipulating a condition in the real sense of the word, a condition with which the OTHER PARTY must comply.

Now, this is the whole tendency of the doctrine of an election in foresight of faith, that when it is consistently carried out it imperatively demands the stipulating of a real condition, which man must fulfill by his own power or action, or to whose fulfillment man must in some way contribute his part, as the Ohio Synod teaches that conversion is dependent not alone on the grace of God, but also on the conduct of man. This makes man in part the author of his own conversion, and this doctrine we reject, because by it the doctrines of man's total depravity and of salvation by the grace of God alone are overthrown.

Dietrich's Catechism holds the middle ground between the unconditional election of the Calvinists and the conditional election of the Rationalists and Synergists, and THIS

IS THE GROUND WHICH MISSOURI OCCUPIES. We teach neither a conditional nor an unconditional election, and say with the Book of Concord :

"The eternal election God not only foresees and foreknows the salvation of the elect, but through His gracious will and good pleasure in Christ Jesus, is also a cause which procures, works, facilitates and promotes our salvation and whatever pertains to it; and upon this our salvation is so firmly grounded that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."—(2d N. Market Ed., p. 712.)

It is true that at the Free English conference held in Gravelton, Mo., Aug. 17-20, 1872, in which Drs. Walther, F. A. Schmidt and P. C. Henkel took part, the subject of election was not discussed. It is hardly probably that any one ever seriously adduced the presence of Dr. Henkel at that conference as a proof of his agreement with Dr. Walther in the doctrine of Predestination. Still it might not be amiss to say here that in the minutes of that conference that express the belief of Dr. Henkel, there are contained sentences, to which another member of the same conference, who has since that time fallen into the error of synergism, cannot uprightly subscribe. Thus we read on page 7 of these minutes: "Man is only the object that is to be converted, and he does not himself co-operate towards it."

"We have here to do with a great mystery, because it seems as though it were the fault of God, if a person is not converted. It seems as though God passed by some men. But we hold fast that a converted person is such *only by the grace of God*; whilst an unconverted person is such by his own fault, because he wantonly resists the grace of God. * * * It is the doctrine of total depravity and corruption after the fall which we here assert, not only in opposition to such gross errors as those by which original sin and our natural depravity are altogether denied, but also over *against more refined aberrations from the truth*, as when some degree of spiritual faculties, or some spark of the life of God, is ascribed to natural man."

On page 8: "The 'natural man' certainly continues to be such a natural man, *until he is converted* and changed by the grace of God; and hence, so long as he remains a natural or unconverted man, the things of the spirit of God must also remain foolishness unto him and cannot be received by him."

The italics are ours. These few sentences serve to set forth

the scriptural, confessionals views held by Dr. Henkel on the subject of conversion. After all, it is the doctrine of conversion that forms the main point of controversy between Missouri and those who combat her. Contrast with the expressions above quoted, the false, synergistic expressions of those who teach an election "in view of faith." Thus:

"*Men themselves made the difference*, some yield to the converting influence of the Holy Ghost, permitting themselves to be converted, while others wilfully resist." (Standard 39, 338.)

"God then does not take away that kind of resistance, but *man* must stop it or he cannot be converted." (Standard 40, 242.)

"This is the indifferent state into which converting grace places men and in which they *can either resist or not resist*." (Magazine 3, 7.)

"Ohio believes, that that something else upon which also it still depends whether man is converted and saved, is not again grace, a new grace restricted to few, as if there were still something lacking in the universal grace, but that it is to be sought elsewhere" (namely in the conduct of man.)—(Kirchenzeitung, April 18, 1891.)

Thus it can be seen that Dr. Henkel was far from agreeing with the synergistic errors of the to-day in-view-of-faith teachers. But to come to his position 'on Election.' He did, for all we know, write the letter to Dr. Schmidt quoted on page 39 of "The Situation." Now, mark you, Rev. Yoder plainly intimates that Father Henkel would not have asked Dr. Schmidt to come to Conover, if they had not been agreed. He portrays Dr. Henkel as a consistent Lutheran teacher, who would have nothing to do with a man who had fallen into most grievous error on the important doctrine 'of Election.' This has always been our impression of this great theologian. It cannot be denied that at the time, he wrote the letter quoted, he thought the Synod of Missouri, and with it the Augsburg Confession of Missouri and his successor in Gravelton, Rev. L. M. Wagner, had fallen into error 'on Election.' But was this his fixed and settled opinion until the time of his death in 1889? Did he never have a chance to learn otherwise? In the funeral oration on Dr. Henkel, preached by Rev. L. M. Wagner and published in "Our Church Paper," Oct. 30, 1889, the following statements were,

as far as we know, allowed to pass unchallenged. "I had promised to be with him next spring to work with him for a season. * * * The Missouri Synod has lost a true friend in him. He was one with us in faith and would fain have been one with us in synodical connection."

That Pastor Wagner could make these statements without fear of successful contradiction, he well knew, as he was prepared to substantiate his assertions. This is evident from a letter dated Oct. 14th, 1893, and written to a relative of Dr. Henkel's, in Conover. The portion of the letter in question reads as follows:

"As to Father Henkel's position, I do not see how that can be called into question. The letters I received from him in 1888 and 1889, I have gotten misplaced in my removal to Barton county and back; but in them he stated frequently that he wanted me to give my consent to go to Conover and become a teacher in the College, and that he wanted to bring that school and the whole Tennessee Synod, or as much of it as would stand by pure Lutheran doctrine and practice, into connection with our Missouri Synod. He also spoke of there being some men in connection with Concordia College who were not laboring according to the design on which the school had been founded; and he hoped to get them disconnected with it. And it was to take one of their places that he wanted me, as soon as the vacancy should occur. We did not say anything in that correspondence on any doctrine, for he knew our doctrine then, I suppose, on all points, and there was no more need of speaking on the doctrine of Election than of the Lord's Supper or Baptism. But a long time ago, about the time Ohio sprang that new doctrine of Election, Rev. Henkel did write to me and say that he *then* knew nothing of our position on Election only what he saw in the "Lutheran Standard," and he stated that if what the "Standard" imputed to us was really our position, then he could not agree with us. And who could blame him? Who could agree with us, if what Ohio said was true? But he found out that Ohio was misrepresenting us. And these are the facts in the case of our correspondence, and I will swear to them before a magistrate, if it is necessary."

In view of these facts—facts well known to every one that was in the confidence of Dr. Henkel—there can be no doubt that in the latter years of his life, Dr. Henkel learned to know

Missouri's doctrine on Election, and convinced of the truth of the same, was endeavoring to make arrangements to work hand-in-hand with her.

Prof. Yoder quotes from "Sermon Notes on Election" (in possession of Mr. J. T. Miller, Conover, N. C.): "Faith only the condition in Election," while in a copy of these notes, of which Mr. Miller certifies that it is "a correct copy," we read: "Faith only a condition of Election"—a discrepancy which the reader may explain for himself. With reference to these notes, Mr. Miller writes: "A copy of notes taken by me from a sermon preached by Rev. P. C. Henkel, D. D., on the subject of Election." They are then not Dr. Henkel's notes, but notes jotted down by a hearer during the delivery of the sermon. On the other hand, Dr. Henkel's notes, written by himself, lie before us, and there we read the following statements that are decisive:

"There was nothing foreseen in man that could give rise to Election."

"Faith is not the ground or cause of Election. It is the operation of God, Col. 2:12; 2 Pet. 1:3 4. "It is the gift of God," Eph. 2:8.

In imparting instruction on the subject of Election, Dr. Henkel, read the XI. Art. F. C. with Rev. J. M. Smith, then a student of theology, and said that that was better than he could give in way of explanation: (It is a well-known fact that the B. C. does not contain the expression "in view of faith.") Rev. Smith denies ever having said that Dr. Henkel taught him "in view of faith." What he did say was that David Henkel had used that expression; and that as P. C. Henkel often used his father's exegesis, it was likely that he used the same. "I have no recollection of ever hearing P. C. Henkel use that phrase 'in view of faith,' " Rev. Smith now asserts.

Of David Henkel, it can be seen that he made use of the "in view of faith." But that he does not altogether agree with the modern *synergistic* defenders of this expression, can be as readily seen. Instead of using Phil. 2:12, as do the synergists, to show that man must do something towards his salvation, he says in refuting this in answer to Joseph Moore, pp 155-156:

"The Philipians, whom the apostles exhorted to work out their own salvation, were already regenerated. * * * One thing is to work, in order to be justified before God; but another is

to work, in order to appear, and be blameless, and harmless without rebuke in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation. Not the former, but the latter, is the reason why the apostle exhorted the Philippians to work out their own salvation."

What Rev. David Henkel meant when calling faith the "condition" of election, we may in part gather from his calling "repentance a condition of justification," and quoting Acts 2:88: "Repent and be baptized." (See Fragment VI. p 164.) From this it would seem that Henkel regarded repentance a condition just as we might call baptism a condition, namely, as the way and the means unto justification, and not such a condition which man must fulfill or to whose fulfilment man must do his part. We do not believe that he would have consented to reduce the expression "in view of faith" to "in view of man's conduct towards the Gospel." Gerhard, Quenstedt, Hunnius and others did use the expression in view of faith, but at the same time they condemned it as a heresy to teach that man could contribute something towards conversion. Would David Henkel have sanctioned the doctrine that conversion is in part dependent on man's conduct? Equity requires us to look well into what company we place those who are fallen asleep and no more able to speak for themselves.

In concluding this section relating to Prof. Yoder's vain attempt to define the position of the Tennessee Synod as *he* would like to have it, we would call attention to a grave omission on his part. His readers in that Synod are, no doubt, pained to see that he makes no reference to what might be termed the public writings of the Synod. "Our Church Paper" is never mentioned. Why? It is the paper that in many quarters is looked upon as the organ of the Tennessee Synod; it has been recommended time and time again by her pastors and finds its way into the homes of her members. Why is no reference made to this influential paper that, during the predestination controversy, published many articles pertaining to the subject? Ah, yes! Why indeed? Let Dr. F. H. Schmidt answer. He writes to a Tennessee pastor under date of Aug. 17, 1890 :

"I was not a little surprised to find that you are not all on the Missouri side of the question; as I have been reading the "O. P. P." all along and found nothing but flings there at the "In View of Faith."

As far as Prof. Schmidt could judge from the public writings of the Tenn. Synod, he thought that you "were all on the Mo. side of the question." Too bad isn't it, gentlemen, that he should misjudge you in that way?

But our "Church Paper" should now be allowed to talk thus :

Moreover, is there anything like strict harmony in the teachings of the following questions and answers which we take from a little work entitled "The Doctrine of Predestination," Columbus, Ohio, and the subjoined declarations which we take from the Book of Concord ? The former read thus :

55. "What then directed God in His selection of the persons to be ordained unto salvation ?

"Ans.—Faith in Christ Jesus."—Page 8.

93. "How now would you briefly define God's gracious election ?

"Ans.—To be clear and exact, thus : Election is that eternal and unchangeable decree of God's grace in which God, for the sake of Christ alone, has ordained unto sonship and salvation all those persons of whom He has foreseen that they will finally believe in Christ Jesus."—Page 9.

Thus read the latter :

"Before the world began, before we existed, indeed before the foundation of the world, when certainly we could have done nothing good, we were elected to salvation by grace in Christ according to the purpose of God.—Rom. 9, 11; 2 Tim. 1, 9. And by this doctrine, all false opinions and errors concerning the powers of our natural will, are overthrown; since, before the world began, God decreed and ordained in His counsel, that He Himself by the power of His Holy Spirit, through the Word, would effect and work in us all that belongs to our conversion."—Page 718.

"The following doctrine is, therefore, false and erroneous—namely, that not the mercy of God alone, and the most holy merit of Christ are the cause, but that in us also there is a cause of the election of God, on account of which God has elected us to everlasting life. For, not only before we had done any good, but also before we were born, yea, before the foundation of the world, He elected us in Christ."—Page 726.

Do not these declarations come in conflict with the teachings of the questions and answers just quoted ?

Still the Standard seems to think a "practical seminary" is necessary down South, to teach and inculcate these innovations, and improvements (?) on Christ, the Apostles, and Confessions of the Church.—[Our Church Paper, Jan. 3, 1887.

As to the charge against Rev. Smith, that he tells an untruth when he says that he has not changed his views, he makes the succinct statement :

"At one of the pastoral meetings held during 1890, it was charged upon the leader in debate that he was Calvinistic and with Missouri and what more confirmed this view was, that a pastor read three questions from the Westminster Catechism to this effect: 'Does God desire the salvation of all?' 'Did Christ die for all?' 'Does God not pass by the greater number of mankind and leave them to be damned?' and the leader would not answer. I then firmly thought he was a Calvinist, and at our next meeting an effort was made on my part to rebut his position by any reference to the Bible and Lutheran writers that could be at hand. Having previously seen the minutes of Concordia English District of the Ohio Synod of 1882, I procured them and marked what the Lutheran Church (according to Ohio) had to say, viz: God has redeemed all, preaches the Word to all and selects those who believe, and since the paragraph begins: 'The Lutheran Church,' * * I, of course, jotted down, 'Luth.' The 'Mo.' mark was for my eye to read what she taught (according to Ohio) and not to condemn her. In a word, I did not know then what Mo. taught, except what Ohio had to say in the Standard and minutes—namely, that God selects some and, Calvin-fashion, passes by the rest and does not desire the salvation of all, but only a select few. Therefore, a false impression as to Mo. was made. Later, when I had more light from Mo., I thought differently of Mo. As to Mo. I have changed since I see she is not Calvinistic. As to the phrase, 'in view of faith,' I see that though it can be understood in the right sense, it is liable to mislead and is not in the Confessions, and I, with hundreds of ministers of the Lutheran Church, have dropped the expression and use other ways of speaking of this doctrine. As to the doctrine, I have not changed my views, but have dropped the unconfessional way of explaining it."

Prof. Yoder's indignation at the thought that we "Missourians" should become offended when he and his colleagues sign a paper giving vent to their pent up feelings, is entirely misplaced. Aside from the fact that it did seem "powerfully strange" to many honest hearts in the audience to see extremes meeting—Tennessee and Ohio! We Missourians were not offended. We were grieved. "Why?" Because it "blasted the last hope of long looked and prayed-for peace and unity with our opponents." We remind the professor that at the very start of the Conference, *before there had been any discussion upon the subject proper*, one of the signers of this paper in question tried to introduce a thesis to supersede the regularly appointed theses,

having this import, "that we, the Missourians, have broken historic connection with the Lutheran Church, etc." Was such a course calculated to reassure us that the end and aim of our Free Conferences was to be attained: namely, to compose differences and get together, or was it designed to "shake Mo?" When the discussions, at the will of the majority, had broken loose from all restraint of theses; when the subject had not been half discussed; when the "shaking-scene" had not been a stupendous success, was it in order to cut the Gordian knot with *such* a paper? Without fair, honest, prayerful discussion the die has been cast and the opinion promulgated. "It was our duty," says Pastor Yoder. What! are Lutheran Christians blindly lead thus by their pastors that a mere expression of opinion on the part of their pastors will sway them even as a reed? We do not believe it. Do honest Lutheran hearts long to hear the pure doctrine of their church discussed and defended? We think they do. Do they wish to cause schism and division by cutting off the only chance of ever coming near together? We hope not. And yet Prof. Yoder can write: "We signed and read this paper because we claim that it was not only our *right* and *privilege*, but also our duty to do so under the circumstances!!" Yes it is indeed a *bad* spirit that would suppress free discussion and calumniate those who defend their views.

As for "being attacked by very harsh and severe language, and by personal assault," we do not understand what the gentleman means, but we do solemnly protest against the connection in which the statement is made, as if one of "those Missourians" had been guilty of such a thing!

In conclusion, the authors of this pamphlet ask to be granted a liberty which they hope will not be taken amiss. The cry in our part of the country is: Adhere to the old Tennessee Synod! Good!! The *old* faith which the *old* Tennessee Synod in the days of David Henkel, for instance, maintained over against the lax Lutheran bodies of the Southeast, is worthy of being propagated. However, the

new Tennessee Synod has done the very thing from which David Henkel was instrumental in saving the *old* Tennessee Synod: it has gone over into a general body, with which, according to its own profession, it does not agree. May the Lord speed the day when the Tennessee Synod is again the '*old*' Synod which it used to be!



